UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/107,237	06/30/1998	ALAN HERROD	SYM-0625	7741

7590   09/03/2003

Kennenth D` Alessandro
Sierra Patent Group , Ltd
P.O. Box 6149
Stateline,, NE   89449

EXAMINER
LAO, SUE X

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2126	

DATE MAILED: 09/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 June 2003* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-16 and 33-48* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-16 and 33-48* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

   If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

   a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .	6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-16 and 33-48 are pending. This action is in response to the amendment
filed 6/16/2003. Applicant has amended claims 1, 11, 33, 45, 47 and 48.

2.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be
found in a prior Office action.

3.   Claims 1-16 and 33-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable
over Herrod et al (U S Pat. 5,604,516) in view of Klein et al (U S Pat. 6.507,864).

        As to claim 1, Herrod teaches a method for transferring data (data) from a bar code
reader (bar code scanning module 8) to a software application (form-based GUI
application) having one or more data field (forms such as 7), including the steps of:

        storing (scanner interface 22 which includes scanner interface buffer (col. 16, lines
54-60)) data (data) from a bar code reader (bar code scanning module 8) in an entity
(scan-aware customer control 32 including fields to hold data) (fig. 2);

        storing (store .Action properties as part of the control) identification information
regarding the bar code reader (.Action property SOURCE_SCANNER set to identify the
bar code reader as data input source) together with the data (data) in the entity (store as
part of the control); [col. 11, line 50 - col. 12, line 30, lines 56-64; col. 13, lines 33-37];

        transferring the entity to the software application (data entry into GUI application);

        associating the entity with a data field (form 7 including customer controls) in the
software application based on the identification information (provide bar code entry to
associated control field 30). See col. 1, lines 25-49; col. 4, line 22-37; col. 4, line 66 - col.
6, line 24.

        Herrod does not explicitly teach that the entity is a data object.

        Klein teaches transferring data from a bar code reader (bar code scanner) to a
software application (host application providing container), including using a data object
(data collection object) to communicate data (data entry fields, bar code data) and related

identification information (type of data entered). See col. 4, lines 4-35; col. 5, lines 5-33. Given the teaching of Klein, it would have been obvious to use a data object to implement the entity of Herrod.

The motivation to combine the teachings of Herrod and Klein include the following. Herrod employs an architecture comprising implementation of a local bar code scanner resident on a control machine running a COM object / MS VB controls (col. 4, lines 1-6; col. 16, lines 1-14). Klein identifies the need to update such 'previous proposed' architecture to include the ability of remoting and provides a mechanism for the improvement (col. 2, lines 7-18; col. 6, lines 15-44). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the mechanism of Klein to update the 'previous proposed' architecture of Herrod.

As to claims 2, 3, Herrod teaches data object (VB implementation of scan-ware / customer control), one or more forms (forms), one or more form objects / data selection criteria (multiple controls, .PRP file). See col. 5, lines 1-7, 57-63; col. 11, lines 15-16.

As to claim 4, Herrod teaches routing the data object to one of the form objects chosen based on the data selection criteria and the identification information (col. 5, lines 8-30).

As to claim 5, Herrod teaches form objects associated with a specific form collectively describe the data input requirements of the form (format, properties, col.s 6-8).

As to claim 6, Herrod teaches identification information including indications of past history of data flow through the system (previous record, col. 6, line 2-10; col. 15, lines 46-56).

As to claims 7, 8, Herrod teaches one or more input requestors (operator), selection criteria specifying conditions for using the data object to satisfy (property / .PRP files, col. 7-8).

As to claim 9, Herrod teaches selection criteria including content of the data, and format of the data (properties of the controls, (property / .PRP files, col. 7-8). Including identification information would have been obvious in view of the discussion of claim 1.

As to claims 10, 11, Herrod teaches processing the data in the data object (input, retrieve, display). In Herrod, the processing details of the data object are not known the form object because such information is stored in .PRP files and retrieved during run-time initialization.

As to claim 12, Herrod teaches transferring step is performed by an operating system (VB platform and underlying DOS).

As to claims 13, 14, 16, Herrod teaches data exchange in local as well as remote fashions (col. 5, lines 1-3). Herrod teaches sending the data to a data exchange mechanism including OLE/COM (OLE/COM implemented by VB). It is noted that DDE is a predecessor of OLE, DCOM is a distributed form of COM, and CORBA is the major competing standard to DCOM. Therefore, it would have been obvious to use one of these as the data exchange mechanism depending on the underlying system hardware / software configuration.

As to claim 15, Herrod teaches operations including operation sequencing/synchronization, data translation, content filtering, and path routing (initializing scan-aware customer controls with control data / property file).

As to claim 33, it is a system claim of claim 1, thus note the discussion of claim 1, and memory writer, sender and matcher are inherent to the system of Herrod.

As to claims 34-48, note the corresponding claims 2-16, respectively, for discussions.

4.   Applicant's arguments filed 6/16/2003 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Regarding claim 1 and the Herrod reference, applicant argued that (1) Herrod does not teach storing the information in an entity that is a data object, (2) Herrod does not teach receiving data from a bar code reader and storing the information in an entity along with an identification of the bar code reader. (Remarks, paragraph bridging pages 8 and 9).

The examiner's response is as follows. As to (1), the combination of Herrod and Klein meets the data object as claimed. Refer to the discussion of claim 1 for detail.

As to (2), Herrod teaches receiving data (scanned data) from a bar code reader (bar code scanning module 8) and storing the information (scanned data) in an entity (scan-aware customer control 32) along with an identification (property SOURCE_SCANNER which identifies the bar code reader as the data input source) of the bar code reader, in that the property SOURCE_SCANNER, which is an .Action property, is stored as part of the control 32 itself. See col. 11, line 50 - col. 12, line 30, lines 56-64; col. 13, lines 33-37. The .Action property is used by the application to identify/determine the source of the data in the field of the control.

Applicant further argued that (3) in Herrod, there is no need to identify which device provided the input because the object was set to receive input from only one device, whereas in claim 1 the method may receive input from another device besides the bar code reader / allow more than one device to provide input to a field. (Remarks, page 9, 2nd paragraph).

The examiner's response is as follows. As to (3), for each data field Herrod allows at least two possible sources of input, scanned data and keyed entry, alone or in combination. See col. 6, lines 9-64; col. 16, lines 15-26. Therefore, there is need in Herrod to identify which device provided the input. It is noted that claim 1 does not require receiving input from another device besides the bar code reader, nor allowing more than one device to provide input to a field. See entire claim 1.

5.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sue Lao whose telephone number is (703) 305-9657. A voice mail service is also available at this number. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications, (703) 746-7239 for Official communications and (703) 746-7240 for Non-Official/Draft communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

Sue Lao *Sue Lao*
August 22, 2003